

We believe that the pricing situation and quality increase of peanuts produced is so well documented by information previously presented to you that an increase in support price of \$36.00 per ton should be granted for this market season.

The peanut industry is faced, as is every other phase of our agriculture, with the continuing rise in cost of operation. It costs our peanut producers money to improve the quality standards of their product. The support price on peanuts today is considerably less for a higher average grade than it was earlier for a lesser average grade. In addition to the reduced support price, we find also that the national allotment is a million acres less than the wartime peak of 2.6 million. These factors, combined with the greatly increasing production costs, place peanut producers in a dire financial bind.

Recently an article appeared in many of our Virginia papers stating that peanut producer income had been increased and his general financial situation was quite satisfactory. Virginia peanut producers were quite surprised to see such a statement inasmuch as it was not consistent with present economic conditions at least as far as peanut income is concerned.

This news item was released by your Department. We respectfully request that this item be looked into and that the public record be corrected. We further request that you reconsider your earlier decision not to grant an increase in peanut support price and proceed to grant, for the market season, the \$36.00 per ton increase for peanuts as recommended by the peanut industry.

Yours truly,

ROBERT B. DELANO, *President.*

THE PUERTO RICAN FAMILY AND THE ANTHROPOLOGIST

(Mr. DANIELS (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, a very able and distinguished constituent of mine, Dr. Frank Cordasco, of Montclair State College, has written a very outstanding criticism of Oscar Lewis' "La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family and the Culture of Poverty, San Juan and New York."

Mr. Speaker, as one who is vitally interested in improving the lot of our Spanish-speaking fellow Americans and integrating this group into the mainstream of American life without sacrificing their ancient Hispanic culture, I think it is imperative that all Members of this House are given the opportunity of reading the "other side." Thus, it is a great honor for me to insert at this point in the RECORD this outstanding critique by a very distinguished American scholar.

Dr. Cordasco's article follows:

THE PUERTO RICAN FAMILY AND THE ANTHROPOLOGIST: OSCAR LEWIS, "LA VIDA, AND THE CULTURE OF POVERTY"

(By Frank M. Cordasco, professor of education, Montclair State College, educational consultant, Migration Division, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico)

Few European scholars (and fewer American savants) have managed to scale the ramparts of academe and carry their intellectual wares into the lay market place: those who have, almost inevitably, have earned the envy and suspicion of their professional confrères, and the countless dollars of dilettantish lay readers who have acquired fashion and prized erudition in frenzied pur-

suit of the erstwhile academicians. Most often, historians and sociologists (Cesare Lombroso, Guglielmo Ferrero, Oswald Spengler, H. G. Wells, and W. G. Sumner come easily to mind) have made the trek from Parnassus into the valley of discord. Successively, they have titillated, infuriated, amused and mesmerized their lay audiences: they have cast dazzling pearls before raucous crowds, and they have counted ducats; and few have remembered to return home to their Olympian lairs. The latest of the academic itinerants is the anthropologist Oscar Lewis who has studied Blackfeet Indians in Canada, farmers in Texas, and the culture of the Indian sub-continent. And all of this he has done well; but with the publication of *La Vida*,¹ Professor Lewis has disappeared into the lay *gethsemane* to which, with some timorous flirtation, his *Five Families* (1959), *The Children of Sanchez* (1961) and *Pedro Martinez* (1964) had earlier brought him.

La Vida (an enormously thick, *nondescripto* Teutonic volume) is the first of a series on Puerto Rican slum families in San Juan and New York which Professor Lewis plans. It is part of the burgeoning literature on the Puerto Rican community, and beyond the accolades it has received from book distribution clubs, (which have been ecstatic in their praises) *La Vida* has been hailed as "... one of the most important books published in the United States this year," cautioned against, in that (its) insights ... will depend upon the compassion and perception of the reader; and energetically questioned: "Is he (Professor Lewis) describing Puerto Ricans, ... or is he describing exceptional people, leading exceptional lives, who resemble their fellow Puerto Ricans only in limited ways?"²

THE PLAN OF "LA VIDA"

Basic to any of these considerations is Professor Lewis' plan for *La Vida*, and his theory of the "culture of poverty" out of which the plan evolves. If the plan of *La Vida* is deceptively simple, Professor Lewis' "culture of poverty" is not; yet one is meaningless without the other, and it is not the portraiture of *La Vida* (a vast pathological Eloge) which gives validity to the theory, but rather the theory which is the *deus ex machina* of Professor Lewis' vast social tableau.

The plan for *La Vida* takes on Zolaesque proportion: some three hundred individuals cross its pages. While preparing the volume Professor Lewis studied nineteen related households, eleven in San Juan and eight in New York; and data on twelve other households appear in the book. The Ríos family which is presented "consists of five households, a mother and two married daughters in Puerto Rico and a married son and daughter in New York. The mother, Fernanda Fuentes ... is now living with her sixth husband in La Esmeralda, a San Juan slum. Her children—Soledad, twenty-five; Felicitá, twenty-three; Simplicio, twenty-one; and Cruz, nineteen—were born to Fernanda while she was living in free union with her first husband, Christobal Ríos, a light-skinned Puerto Rican." Professor Lewis' family kaleidoscope revolves about Fernanda in San Juan; Soledad in New York; Felicitá in San Juan; Simplicio in New York; and Cruz in San Juan. It is a harrowing tale of two cities

¹ *La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty—San Juan and New York*. By Oscar Lewis. Random House (1966). 669 pp. \$10.00

² See the reviews, respectively, of Michael Harrington, *New York Times Book Review*, November 20, 1966, p. 1; Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, *America*, December 10, 1966, p. 778; and Nathan Glazer, *Commentary*, February, 1967, p. 83. See also the negative sentiments in the review by Joseph Monserrat, "A Puerto Rican Family," *Natural History* (April 1967).

of life-styles largely recorded on tape which Professor Lewis has edited to present the details of the way of life of the Ríos family with Karamazovian affectlessness. And there is no absence of detail. What emerges is a vast panorama of social and psycho-pathology; cruelty and violence; deceit; the subtleties of human degradation; endemic social deviance; the "game" of prostitution; consensual unions; and abandonment; and omnipresent sex never missing from the lives of the protagonists and recorded with such literalness of language and an unrestrained abundance of detail by Professor Lewis that it initially shocks and, then, revolts the reader.³ The Ríos family are a *dramatis personae* in search of an author and in a curious Pirandellian twist, Professor Lewis not only furnishes a play, but a theory as well. It is this theory (the "Culture of Poverty") which translates *La Vida* into Balzacian reality or into grotesque illusion.

PROFESSOR LEWIS AND THE CULTURE OF POVERTY

Professor Lewis (by his own statement) originated the concept of the "Culture of Poverty"; as a conceptual model, he has attempted its precise definition. The trick lies in distinguishing between "poverty" and the "culture of poverty": for the Ríos family is not representative of the poor, but rather of the subculture of poverty (Professor Lewis uses the shorter form); and this subculture of poverty focuses upon the individual personality rather than upon the group (that is, upon the family and the slum community).⁴ Lewis defines the "culture of poverty" as, "... both an adaptation and a reaction of the poor to their marginal position in a class-stratified, highly individuated, capitalistic society. It represents an effort to cope with feelings of hopelessness and despair which develop from the realization of the improbability of achieving success in terms of the values and goals of the larger society. Indeed, many of the traits of the culture of poverty can be viewed as attempts at local solutions for problems not met by existing institutions and agencies because the people are not eligible for them, cannot afford them or are ignorant or suspicious of them." (p. xlii). However, Professor Lewis is quick to add that the "culture of poverty" is ... not only an adaptation to a set of objective conditions of the larger society. Once it comes into existence it tends to perpetuate itself from generation to generation because of its effects on the children. By the time slum children are age six or seven, they have usually absorbed the basic values and attitudes of their subculture and are not psychologically geared to take full advantage of changing conditions or increased opportunities which may occur in their lifetime." (p. xiv). Daniel Moynihan refines the theory and adds still other ingredients: "... these families and the communities they make up (in the culture of poverty) tend to transmit from one generation to the next, through a circumstance which help perpetuate their condition. There is nothing absolute about this: as many individuals, no doubt, leave the culture as remain in it, and on one level the

³ See the description of Soledad's relationship with Benedict as an illustration of the pervasive luridness, pp. 17 ff.

⁴ Cf. Michael Harrington's definition of the "culture of poverty" in his *The Other America* (1961). See also Elizabeth Herzog, "Some Assumptions About the Poor," *The Social Service Review*, December 1963, pp. 389-402; and Nathan Glazer, *loc. cit.*, *supra*. Professor Lewis is not without historical predecessors who have attempted to fashion a viable theory out of the poignant evocations and delineations of human misery: Henry Haythorn's *London Labour and the London Poor* (1861-62) is an analogous tableau; and so is the literary and sociological canon of Mid-Victorian England.

proposition amounts to little more than the assertion that the poor rarely inherit large estates." (Commentary, February 1967, p. 36. The italics have been added.)

This adaptive ambience, Professor Lewis finds both creative and the source of great strengths (with its own structure and rationale, as a way of life), but with the key traits of fatalism and a low level of aspiration "(which) helps to reduce frustration, (and with) the legitimization of short-range hedonism (which) makes possible spontaneity and enjoyment." Within these theoretic constructs, Professor Lewis analyzes the "culture of poverty" against four sets of characteristics: (1) the lack of effective participation and integration of the poor in the major institutions of the larger society; (2) poor housing, crowding, gregariousness, and a minimum of organization beyond the level of the nuclear and extended family; (3) the baseness of childhood as a specially prolonged and protected stage in the life cycle; early initiation into sex, free unions or consensual marriages, high incidence of abandonment of wives and children, female-centered families, lack of family stability, authoritarianism; (4) marginality, helplessness, dependence and inferiority. In essence, if one is disposed to accept the thesis, Professor Lewis' discussion is a major contribution to the "culture of poverty."

Lewis develops the thesis and basic methodology in a lengthy introduction (pp. xi-iv) which must be read if the book is to be kept in its proper setting. The socio-economic correlates of the theory, *mutatis mutandis*, vis a vis the Negro community were developed by Daniel Moynihan in *The Case For National Action* (1965). Although Lewis, at no point in any substance, relates his "culture of poverty" to the schools and education, Moynihan does. In a review of the controversy spawned by *The Negro Family* (the Moynihan Report), he gives the theory a significant and new dimension: "At the moment, Negroes are placing enormous confidence in the idea that quality education can transform their situation. But it is not at all clear that education has this potential. Last summer, the U.S. Office of Education issued its report on 'Equality of Educational Opportunity' based on the study . . . ordered by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 of the educational facilities available to Negroes and other minority groups as compared with the white majority. The report (The Coleman Report) . . . radically confounded expectation. Negroes, it turned out, tested badly at the outset of their schooling, and worse at the end of it. But the quality of the schools they attended—shockingly segregated schools—was not in fact significantly different from that of schools attended by whites and others. More important, the regression analysis carried out for the study produced the astounding proposition that the quality of the schools has only a trifling relation to achievement . . . the two great determinants of outcome turned out to be family background and social peer group." (Commentary, February 1967, p. 44.)

THE VAST SLOUGH OF "LA VIDA"

Caught in the vast slough of *La Vida*, the central question for the Rios family is their typicality: is Professor Lewis describing exceptional people, leading exceptional lives, who resemble their fellow Puerto Ricans in only limited ways? The very viability of Lewis' theory of "the culture of poverty" depends on the answer to this crucial question. Unfortunately, Professor Lewis is ambiguous in his answer. Although he disclaims the representativeness of the Rios family ("I should like to emphasize that this study deals with only one segment of the Puerto Rican population and that the data should not be generalized to Puerto Rican society as a whole."), he still claims a much larger significance and typicality: "The Rios family would probably be classified as a multi-problem family by most social work-

ers, but it is by no means an extreme example nor is it the worst I have encountered in the Puerto Rican slums;" and he extends his observation by noting, "The history of the Rios family . . . suggests that the pattern of free unions and multiple spouses was not limited to the poor. It has been a widespread pattern among wealthy rural families" (pp. xviii-xxix). In much of the data, the tendency is always the cultivation of a special perspective even if this leads Professor Lewis to distortion.

CONTINUING DOUBTS

Clearly, continuing doubts frame a crucial question: is *La Vida* a study of the culture of lower-class Puerto Rican life; or is it a study of the culture of radically disorganized forms of slum life? Does all poverty lead to Professor Lewis' culture of poverty? For the theory must, if it has any validity, be more than the adaptation to the urban ambience which is its nexus: is it (for Professor Lewis) culture itself? All of the indices of Professor Lewis' "culture of poverty" (its marginality, and its helplessness, its sex and its prostitution) are related to poverty, but is the microcosm which Professor Lewis sketches in the macabre vignettes of the Rios family the very substance of poverty itself?

The controversy which surrounds *La Vida* will obscure many of the important questions it raises. It will, unhappily, overshadow the tremendous struggle of the Puerto Rican community (both on the mainland and in the island) to confront the realities of the grim social and economic problems;⁵ it will minimize the gains achieved in mainland schools;⁶ it will register as crude parodies the poetic pathos of the Puerto Rican poor.⁷ And it will be widely read, misinterpreted and misused.

⁵ See particularly, Dorothy D. Bourne and James R. Bourne, *Thirty Years of Change in Puerto Rico* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger (1966); and *The Puerto Rican Community Development Project: Un Proyecto Puertorriqueño De Ayuda Mutua Para El Desarrollo De La Comunidad* (New York: The Puerto Rican Forum (1964).

⁶ "Most of our children are brought up in homes where the language and culture is still mostly shaped along the way of life parents lived in Puerto Rico. This is good and positive and it has to be so because parents themselves cannot transmit what they do not know, but here is where the school enters as the institution that will help transmit the new culture into a child's life, and for that matter into the home as a whole. We pledge our support in all aspects where community support will be needed." Statement of Carmen Dinos (Supervisor of the Education Program of the Migration Division of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) before the Board of Education of New York City, March 11, 1966. See also, F. Cordasco, "Puerto Rican Pupils and American Education," *School and Society*, vol. 95 (February 18, 1967), pp. 116-119.

⁷ "Ricardo Sanchez came from where the sugar cane is higher than a man to the plaza in old San Juan where the buses marked *Aeropuerto* stop. He came with his wife and two daughters and three suitcases and a paper bag and the promise from a brother in Harlem, New York, that there was work to be found in *fabrics*. The work in the sugar cane was over for the season and Ricardo had found nothing else. The government would pay him \$7 every two weeks for thirteen weeks before the season began again, and then with the season he would get \$3.60 a day for eight hours in the sun. He had done it before, as his father had done it but this time he told himself he wanted something more. 'It is,' he said, 'no good to be poor.'" Dan Wakefield, *Island in the City. The World of Spanish Harlem* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1959), p. 23.

VOTE ON NATIONAL RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE AFFECTING THE NATIONAL INTEREST AND VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 15 when the House was considering House Joint Resolution 559 to provide for the settlement of the railway labor dispute, I voted for the Pepper amendment to strike section 5 of the resolution providing for compulsory arbitration.

I did so because I am opposed to compulsory arbitration of labor disputes and it was my understanding on that date that there would be no railway strike if the Pepper amendment was adopted. I have always strongly supported free collective bargaining in labor-management negotiations of labor disputes, and my record in the Massachusetts Legislature and in the Congress of the United States over 32 years of public service bears this out.

Yesterday this Nation was caught in the grip of a national emergency because of the combined strike and lockout of the railroad craft unions. Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd informed President Johnson that between 80 to 90 percent of the Nation's rail lines had closed down by noon, and predicted the rail paralysis would be complete by last midnight.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told the President the railway strike was having "an immediate impact on the movement of ammunition and heavy equipment to ports of embarkation for Vietnam. Ammunition cars—a thousand each week—must move without interruption to support our fighting men in Vietnam."

President Johnson told the Congress hundreds of thousands of commuters found it difficult or impossible to get to their jobs yesterday; 400,000 carloads of freight had been stranded; shipments of fresh vegetables, meats, and other perishable foods had been halted; mail deliveries of packages and parcels, magazines, and newspapers had been embargoed by the Post Office.

The economic well-being of the United States and America's national security were in jeopardy. Our national interest was at stake.

Faced with these set of circumstances, I voted for Senate Joint Resolution 81, providing for settlement of the railroad labor dispute.

Mr. Speaker, I am still opposed to compulsory arbitration. I do not think that this is the way to settle labor disputes in a free and open society. But the transcendent issue before the House when the vote was taken last night was the national interest—the necessity of a free government, and its free people, to protect itself at home and overseas.

I was not voting on a party issue nor a partisan political issue. I was not voting in the interest of labor nor of management. I was voting my conscience on an issue of paramount importance—the national interest and against delays in

ammunition and supply shipments to our troops in Vietnam.

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. COHELAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. COHELAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A TRIBUTE AND A LESSON

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the terrible toll of life and personal injury, the damage to private property, and the aggravation of racial bitterness, the riots in Newark last week had a less apparent result. My close friend, the distinguished Governor of New Jersey, Richard J. Hughes, was forced by this tragic riot to divert his energies from his attempts to achieve peace and progress to the very basic task of restoring law and order to the streets of his State's cities. Governor Hughes turned to this job as he turns to all jobs—with great ability and energy. Order is now being restored and the attempts to repair the devastation are in progress.

It behooves us in the Congress to again ask, why was there a riot? Unfortunately, there is no easy answer. I diligently read all the reports of the riots in the New Jersey as well as the New York and Washington newspapers, and I talked with responsible persons on the scene in Newark. According to these news reports and my personal conversations, there was no evidence that the riots had been started or aided in any way by "outsiders." However, there was evidence that the all too familiar causes of riots as we have come to know them were present: inadequate housing, high unemployment, problems with the police, and a belief by the Negroes that the local government was unresponsive to their needs and aspirations.

These causes are by now well known. They are highlighted in a recent column by David S. Broder, which appeared in the Washington Post of July 13, and which I insert in this RECORD for the Members' attention. Mr. Broder's column is not only a tribute to Governor Hughes, but more importantly, contains a lesson for the Congress and the Nation. It follows:

THE LESSON OF RICHARD J. HUGHES

(By David S. Broder)

For an object lesson in the ability of events in this tragic time to make a mockery of the aspirations of even the most decent men, consider the case of Gov. Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey.

Last month Gov. Hughes helped set the stage for the Kossygin-Johnson summit by providing an acceptable meeting place in the unlikely town of Glassboro, N.J.

Last Wednesday in Washington, he presided over the meeting that launched the Democratic Party toward its first fully desegregated national convention in 1968.

And then last weekend, decent, determinedly optimistic Dick Hughes found himself in the command post of a war against what he termed the "criminal insurrection" of the Negro inhabitants of Newark, his State's largest city.

What a measure of our times for a man like Hughes to be fighting, not for peace or for progress, not for integration or the Great Society, but for the rudimentary civil order that is the first condition of any society at all. When a Dick Hughes can be hauled back from the area of his real aspirations in order to do a police job, it says something about our country and our world.

Until last month, when millions of Americans became at least dimly aware of Hughes as the Kewpie doll-looking man who welcomed the President and the Soviet Premier to Glassboro, he was known outside his own state only to that small circle of men to whom government and politics are a full-time concern. But within that circle, Dick Hughes has a reputation that is ten feet tall.

Terry Sanford, the former Governor of North Carolina, who has just completed a massive two-year study of the states, remarked recently that "Dick Hughes is running the best state government in the country." That judgment is echoed by Johnson Administration officials.

What is particularly impressive about Hughes' record in New Jersey is his effort to focus state government concern on the two major domestic problems of our time, urban life and education. Last year he hired the brilliant Paul Ylvisaker from the Ford Foundation to head a new state department of urban affairs that has already become a model for the rest of the country.

Last month he persuaded Ralph Dungan, one of the ablest of John Kennedy's staff men, to return from his post as Ambassador to Chile to become New Jersey's Chancellor of Higher Education.

In Party affairs, too, Hughes has more than carried his weight. Under Kennedy and again under Lyndon Johnson, when the President has had a tough political problem he has turned it over to Hughes.

Last week, just two months after he took over as chairman of the Democratic National Committee's equal rights committee, Hughes won a signal victory; a unanimous agreement from Southerners and civil rights advocates on a formula that will, in his judgment, guarantee integrated delegations from all the Southern states for the first time since Reconstruction.

Typically, Hughes, a devout Catholic and devoted family man, declined to discuss the achievement simply in political terms. What the committee had done, he said, was to "redeem the moral pledge" of equal rights made at the 1964 convention and thus "saved the soul of the Democratic Party." Not even the cynics in the press found those sentiments inappropriate from that source.

And then Hughes, the host at Hollybush, the toast of Washington, went home to find in Newark the latest violent manifestation of the Civil War between the "two nations" that no longer peacefully co-exist in this country.

There, in a State which has done as much as any to deal with its urban problems, lay festering a slum that bred as much hatred as the compounds of South Africa. To add to the irony, one of the complaints of its inhabitants concerned the decision to raze 50 acres of their slum for a new State College of Medicine and Dentistry which would be part of Ralph Dungan's domain.

So Richard Hughes, having patiently negotiated the admission of Negro delegates to the Democratic Convention from the old slave-holding states, went home to supervise the militia's offensive against the Negro rioters. Dick Hughes, the model Governor, saw his dreams going up in flames and said, "the line might as well be drawn here as anywhere."

What does this tell us beyond the tragedy of the man himself? It tells us, I think, that time has run out on this country, that even its most far-sighted leaders must recognize now that they must shift their focus to the crisis at the heart of our own society. Before we can bring peace and security to Vietnam or the world, before we can provide the quality of education our children deserve, before we can achieve any of our major goals, we must stop penning Negroes in poverty into cages in the centers of our cities. No matter what it costs, the slums must go. This has to be one Nation, not two, and unless we face that fact now, all of us will be consumed by the tragedy that overwhelmed Richard Hughes last week.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1967

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. Speaker, the annals of American history clearly show that our Nation is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere. That is why we are now fighting in Vietnam. We founded our country on democratic principles and today our commitment to freedom is worldwide in full recognition that the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration.

In 1959, the Congress showed historic initiative in passing the captive nations resolution—Public Law 86-90. This year Captive Nations Week will be marked during the week of July 16-22. It is, therefore, appropriate and proper to manifest to the more than 42 million people in some 27 different captive nations our most heartfelt sympathy and concern for their serious plight under the ruthless heel of their Red Communist overlords and taskmasters.

In the light of the recent Middle East war and in view of the fact that Russia is now rearming Egypt and other Arab countries in order that they may again commit aggression against our sister democracy in that important part of the world—the State of Israel—Captive Nations Week takes on added significance. Here can be seen further evidence of the Communist endeavor to extend their nefarious influence against the free world.

The nations under Communist domination look to the United States, as a citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their eventual liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment and benefits of their respective religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties.

I most strongly urge that everyone give their support to the National Captive Nations Committee and participate in the nationwide observance of this special week. By our doing so, we not only encourage the millions of people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains not